

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite selection of two different sets of intra-frame correlation values based on a scene change determination. Dependent claim 7 has been amended to conform with the amendments to claim 1 and to further clarify the comparing step recited therein. The remainder of the independent claims 14, 27, 40, 53, and 66 have been amended similar to the independent claim 1 and their corresponding dependent claims 20, 33, 46, 59, and 72 have also been amended similar to the amendments to claim 7.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, all of the pending claims 1-78 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao et al (6,041,142) in view of Coombs et al (5,565,998) and Agarwal (5,850,264).

Under the present claim amendments, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a method that includes, in part: "calculating an intra-frame correlation value for each of said pseudo frames...; selecting a first set of intra-frame correlation values when a current pseudo frame represents a new scene or a continuation of a scene; selecting a second set of intra-frame correlation values when the current pseudo frame represents an end of a scene, wherein intra-frame correlation values in said first and said second sets are non-overlapping; and analyzing a corresponding one of said first set or said second set of correlation values to identify the source of each frame in said series." Thus, the amended claim 1 recites the selection of two different sets of intra-frame correlation values (calculated for the pseudo frames) based on the scene change status determination for the current pseudo frame and use of the appropriate set to identify the source of the current frame. This selection process is described in more detail on pages 5-7 in the specification of the application.

Based on the present claim amendments, Applicant asserts that none of the cited references (Rao, Coombs, or Agarwal) teaches or suggests, either alone or in combination, the selection of two different sets of intra-frame correlation values in combination with the other steps recited in amended claim 1. Hence, neither Rao nor Coombs or Agarwal, either alone or in combination, renders obvious the subject matter recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

The remainder of the independent claims 14, 27, 40, 53, and 66 have been amended similar to claim 1 to recite the selection and use of two different sets of intra-frame correlation values. Applicant submits that for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, claims 14, 27, 40, 53, and 66 are also patentable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14, 27, 40, 53, and 66 under 35 USC § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Applicant has not at this time presented arguments in favor of the patentability of the dependent claims nor has applicant challenged the Examiner's interpretation of Rao. Applicant reserves the right to submit arguments in favor of the dependent claims as well as arguments directed to Rao should that become necessary.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance for claims 1-78 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicant's attorney at the number requested below so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske
Reg. No. 29,688
Thorp Reed & Armstrong, LLP
One Oxford Centre, 301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
412-394-7789
Attorneys for Applicants